IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.R.RAMAN
&
THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE K.HEMA

THURSDAY, THE 7TH JUNE 2007 / 17TH JYAISHTA 1929

WP(Crl.).No. 114 OF 2007(S)

PETITIONER:

BULKIEZ, W/O.LATE ALI, AGED.40 YEARS,
KATTAPPALLY HOUSE,
MEKKALADY KARA, KALADY VILLAGE, ALUVA TALUK,
ERNAKULAM DIST.

BY ADV. SRI.SIRAJ KAROLY

RESPONDENTS:

1. RIBI @ RIBIYA, AGED.18 YEARS,
D/O.LATE ALI, KATTAPPALLY HOUSE,
MEKKALADY KARA, KALADY VILLAGE, ALUVA TALUK,
ERNAKULAM DIST.

2. BINU.A.K., S/O.KUNJAPPAN,
AMBATTUPARAMBIL HOUSE,
LAKSHAM VEEDU COLONY, MEKKALADY, KALADY VILLAGE,
ERNAKULAM DIST.

3. THE SUB INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
KALADY POLICE STATION,
KALADY, ERNAKULAM DIST.

4. THE DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE,
ERNAKULAM RURAL, ALUVA.

5. THE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE,
POLICE HEAD QUARTERS,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

BY ADV. SRI.DINESH MATHEW J.MURICKEN
R3 TO R5 BY ADDL. D.G.P. SRI. V. K. MOHANAN.

THIS WRIT PETITION (CRIMINAL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 07/06/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

WP(CRL.) 114/2007

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:

EXT.P1	**A TRUE COPY OF THE RECEIPT ISSUED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT.**
EXT.P2	**A TRUE COPY OF THE RELEVANT PAGE OF THE SSLC BOOK OF PETITIONER'S DAUGHTER.**
EXT.P3	**A TRUE COPY OF THE PETITION SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE 3RD RESPONDENT DATED 6.5.2007.**

// TRUE COPY //

P.S. TO JUDGE.

KNC/-

P.R. RAMAN & K. HEMA, JJ.

= = = = = = = = = = = = = =

W.P.(CRL) NO. 114 OF 2007

= =

DATED THIS, THE 7TH DAY OF JUNE, 2007.

J U D G M E N T

Raman, J.

This writ petition is filed alleging that the petitioner's daughter Ribi alias Ribiya is missing from 4.5.2007. According to the petitioner, her daughter Ribiya is illegally detained by the second respondent, who is a resident of the locality.

2. Notice was served on the respondents and the alleged detenue Ribi alias Ribiya , who is the first respondent in this writ petition, was produced before us. She has completed 18 years of age even as on 4.5.2007, the day on which she was alleged to have been taken away by the second respondent. On interaction with her, we find that she is not under the illegal custody of the second respondent and according to her, she has married him. We also interacted with the second respondent as well as with his parents and we are made to understand that the parents of the second respondent are agreeable to accept her as their daughter in law. Since the

girl has already attained majority and she has submitted that she is not under the illegal custody of the second respondent as alleged in the writ petition, the writ petition stands closed.

P.R. RAMAN,
(JUDGE)

K. HEMA,
(JUDGE)

knc/-